



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,593	07/18/2003	Rajeev S. Bhide	LD0338 NP	4312

23914 7590 08/11/2004

STEPHEN B. DAVIS
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY
PATENT DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 4000
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000

EXAMINER

BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/622,593	Applicant(s) BHIDE ET AL.	
	Examiner Venkataraman Balasubramanian	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22, 12/18, 2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 10/22/2003 and 12/18 2003 are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim and share the same limitation.

1. Recitation of "its enantiomers, diastereomers, pharmaceutically acceptable salts prodrugs or solvates thereof" in claim 1, renders this claim indefinite as it is not clear whether the claim is compound claim or composition claim with above said limitations. Note Markush recitation should be in alternate form and in singular.
2. In claim 1, recitation of the term "prodrugs" is deemed as indefinite. Prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the definition of various variable R and Y, groups include such groups, namely esters, amides, alkoxycarbonyl etc. and therefore it is not

clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug groups. There is clear-cut ambiguity as to what is to be considered as prodrug and what is not. Applicants should note that if the variable groups are prodrug, which are in general inactive but becomes active upon in vivo transformation, then the compound bearing the variable group would be deemed as inactive which is not what the claim recites.

Furthermore, the issue on second paragraph is whether the structures of the claimed compounds are clearly defined. Applicants' "prodrugs" are molecules whose structure lie outside the subject matter of formula (I), but upon metabolism in the body are converted to active compounds falling within the structural scope of formula (I). The claim describes the function intended but provides no specific structural guidance to what constitutes a "prodrug". Structural formulas, names, or both can accurately describe organic compounds, which are the subject matter of claim 1. Attempting to define means by function is not proper when the means can be clearly expressed in terms that are more precise. Applicants list the function that these prodrugs are to perform in the passage spanning line 32, page 12 to line 11, page 13 but offer no structural guidance as to which derivatives are intended.

Claim 1 is also indefinite as it is not clear what is R^{41} when Z is N. It is not possible to know what compounds are claimed when Z is N.

3. Recitation of "at least one of the compounds of" in claims 7-10, 12-15, and 20 renders these claims indefinite as it appears that the composition claim includes

other active ingredient besides the compound recited in the instant claims. Replacement of "at least one of the compounds of" with "one or more" is suggested.

4. Claim 11 recites the limitation "said anti-cancer or cytotoxic agent" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Note claim 11 is a dependent on claim 7 which does not recite the functional language.
5. Recitation of the phrase "including" in claim 11 last but one line renders this claim indefinite as the term is open-ended and can include more than what is being positively recited therein. See MPEP 2111.03 which states: The transitional term "comprising", which is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by," is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps. See, e.g., *Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.*, 112 F.3d 495, 501, 42 USPQ2d 1608, 1613 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("Comprising" is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim.); *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 229 USPQ 805 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Baxter*, 656 F.2d 679, 686, 210 USPQ 795, 803 (CCPA 1981); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948) ("comprising" leaves "the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts").

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 1624

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making prodrugs of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry - to use the invention. "The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. a) Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, and produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism 'de novo, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be biologically active. Thus, determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

Art Unit: 1624

b) The direction concerning the prodrugs is found in the passage spanning line 32, page 12 to line 11, page 13. c) There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (I). d) The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. e) The state of the prodrug art is summarized by Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry). The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (Modern Pharmaceutics) in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. f) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrugs as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience. g) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", 'and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula of claim I as well as the presently unknown list potential prodrug derivatives embraced by the word "prodrug".

Thus, undue experimentation will be required to determine if any particular derivative is, in fact, a prodrug.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above. In the present case the important factors leading to a conclusion of undue experimentation are the absence of any working example of a formed solvate, the lack of predictability in the art, and the broad scope of the claims.

c) There is no working example of any solvate formed. The claims are drawn to solvates, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...' no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

g) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stabile region of the solvate.

h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula. (I) as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate". Thus, the scope is broad.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright,

Art Unit: 1624

999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).” That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants’ invention.

Claims 16-20 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating angiogenesis, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any proliferative disease, cancer, inflammation, autoimmune disease, or “diseases associated with signal transduction pathways operating through growth factor receptors”. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above.

The instant claims are drawn to “treating a proliferative disease” and “treating cancer”, by inhibiting protein kinases in general. The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer or any or all proliferative diseases due to protein kinase inhibition including those yet to be discovered as due said mode of action for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification at pages 1 and 18-19. The instant compounds are disclosed to have protein kinase inhibitory activity (VEGF, FGFR kinases) and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It appears that the

Art Unit: 1624

applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as kinase inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of proliferative diseases and cancers, autoimmune diseases, any inflammation or any disease which involve signal trasnduction pathway. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as psoriasis and cancers , autoimmune diseases are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many drugs, which can be used for "inflammatory condition".

The scope of the claims involves all of the thousands of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms proliferative disease, cancer, inflammation, and autoimmune disease, or the unknown list of "diseases associated with signal transduction pathways operating through growth factor receptors".

Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the *Helicobacter pylori* infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

Inflammation is a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by

Art Unit: 1624

which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no “magic bullet” against inflammation generally.

The “autoimmune diseases” are a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There are hundreds such diseases, which have fundamentally different mechanisms and different underlying causes. Thus, the scope of claims is extremely broad.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a “compound” is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, “each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study” (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is “speculative”, “sufficiently unusual” or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v.*

Art Unit: 1624

Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See non-patent references cited in the IDS especially Kolch et al..

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

- 1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders/diseases that require protein kinase inhibitory activity.
- 2) The state of the prior art: A very recent publication expressed that the protein kinase inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity

Art Unit: 1624

in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of protein kinase inhibitors are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all proliferative diseases and cancers including those yet to be related to protein kinase.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Art Unit: 1624

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hunt et al. WO 00/71129.

Hunt et al. teaches several structurally similar pyrrolotriazine compounds, which include generically compounds, composition and the method of use claimed in the instant claims. See formula I on page 3 and note, given the same core, all variable groups overlap with those of the instant claims. See examples 1-143 shown on pages 25-109. Note when Z = OH, or Cl, the compounds taught by Hunt et al. include these compounds as intermediates.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1624

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al., WO 00/71129.

Hunt et al. teaches several structurally similar pyrrolotriazine compounds, which include generically compounds, composition and the method of use claimed in the instant claims. See formula I on page 3 and note, given the same core, all variable groups overlap with those of the instant claims. See pages 3- 16 for details of the invention and pages 16-25 for the processes of making these compounds. See examples 1-143 shown on pages 25-109. Note example hetero cyclic ring 120 is close to the instant R^{42} and that the point of attachment of such a group can either through the five or six membered ring is clearly taught in these examples. Also note compounds when $Z = N$, or NH or when Z is absent are exemplified.

Instant claims require a specific Z linked to the triazine via a N , O or S . Hunt et al. differs in not exemplifying such compounds.

However, Hunt et al. teaches the equivalency of those compounds exemplified with specific substituents with that generically recited on page 3 and claimed. See formula I and note the definition of Z , R^4 and R^5 . Note when R^4 and R^5 choices include several compounds which are generically claimed in the instant claims.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make pyrrolotriazine compounds variously substituted

Art Unit: 1624

with, X, Y, Z, R¹, R², R³, R⁴, R⁵ and R⁶ as permitted by the reference and expect resulting compounds (instant compounds) to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-7, 12 and 16 of copending Application No. 09/573,829. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims overlaps with the stated claims of 09/573,829. Note when Z=O, S, or N, the compounds, composition and method of use taught by the copending application is same as claimed in the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 and 16-25 of copending Application No. 10/441848. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims overlaps with the stated claims of 10/441,848. Note when $Z=OH$ or SH and R_6 is NR^7R^8 , the compounds, composition and the method of use taught by the copending application is same as claimed in the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 and 4-19 of copending Application No. 10/633,997. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims overlaps with the stated claims of 10/633,997. Note when $Z=OH, Cl, O, S$, the compounds, composition and method of use taught by the copending application is same as claimed in the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from

Art Unit: 1624

8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674. If Applicants are unable to reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.


Venkataraman Balasubramanian

8/4/2004